

To name a few—singer Andy Williams was born in Wall Lake; the Everly Brothers, Don and Phil lived in Shenandoah; Cloris Leachman, who played Phyllis on "The Mary Tyler Moore Show," hails from Des Moines, as did Harriett Nelson of the television series, "The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriett." Marion Michael Morrison, better known as John Wayne, was born in Winterset. The famous musician/composer, Glenn Miller came from Clarinda. And who can ever forget the memorable sounds of the "Music Man," Meridith Wilson is from Mason City. And, last but not least, Mr. President, internationally-acclaimed opera singer, Simon Estes, was born in Centerville, IA.

In addition to the talents of Iowa's hometown celebrities, my State has opened its doors to reveal our scenic countryside to Hollywood film makers. Box office hits filmed in Iowa include, "Field of Dreams," "The Bridges of Madison County," and "Twister." The movie "Bridges" was adapted from the novel written by my fellow Iowan, Robert Waller. If asked, Mr. President, I would have to concur with a popular scene from the movie "Field of Dreams," filmed in eastern Iowa near Dyersville. That scene included the lines—"Is this Heaven? No, it's Iowa."

Mr. President, the list of Iowa-born celebrities includes a hometown girl who never forgot where she came from. The oldest of five children, Donna Belle Mullenger, attended a one room school house and helped with the family chores on a western Iowa farm near Denison. Growing up on a farm, Donna cherished the rare Saturday trips to town, when she would meet friends at the Candy Kitchen and catch a movie at the Ritz Theater.

This girl-next-door later became a household name and Hollywood star. Donna Reed starred in more than 40 films, including such classics as "It's a Wonderful Life," "Portrait of Dorian Gray," and her Oscar-winning performance in "From Here to Eternity." And for 8 years, Donna Reed entertained families in their living rooms across America. "The Donna Reed Show" ran from 1958 to 1965.

As I stated earlier in one of my speeches describing the Iowa Spirit, the people of Iowa strive to excel in any and all endeavors, whether it be education, entertainment or enterprise. And the community of Denison, the county seat of Crawford County, is no exception. In memory of the Hollywood actress who was known to say, "No matter what I do, I am still a farm girl from Denison," the community celebrated a 1-day festival in her honor after her death in 1986. At that time, her Oscar was presented to the city of Denison. One year later, Donna Reed's hometown community, friends and family members formed The Donna Reed Foundation for the Performing Arts to recognize youth and promote education.

The Foundation celebrates its 10th annual Donna Reed Festival this week,

June 15-23. Building on its charter to provide affordable and high quality education to those who share a love for the arts, the Foundation offers performing arts workshops, and awards an annual college scholarship to applicants interested in studying acting, music, and dance. The first scholarship was awarded in 1987 for \$500. Within 8 years, the award had grown to a \$10,000 national scholarship. During this week's festival, performing arts instructors and professionals from New York, California, and the Midwest will conduct about 45 professional workshops. One of the highlights at the festival this year includes a tribute to the 50th anniversary of "It's A Wonderful Life," featuring a reunion of cast and crew.

Mr. President, I proudly salute members of the Denison community and their vision for promoting the arts. Borne of hard work, countless volunteer hours, and unparalleled community spirit, The Donna Reed Foundation has achieved a center for cultural and performing arts in America's heartland.

Mr. President, life in Iowa truly is a wonderful life. And I'm sure the citizens of Denison would be the first to agree.

SALUTE TO KBBG-FM RADIO

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to salute an enterprise undertaken almost two decades ago by two community-oriented entrepreneurs in northeast Iowa. Declaring that radio for the Black community was an idea whose time had come, Jimmie Porter founded KBBG-FM radio in 1977 with his partner, Warren Nash, Jr., in Waterloo, IA. Incorporated as Afro-American Community Broadcasting, Inc., KBBG's charter pledged to fulfill the needs, interests and wishes of ethnic minority people in northeast Iowa.

KBBG has come a long way since its first equipment testing of 10 watts on July 26, 1978. On its first full day of broadcasting that August, KBBG reached a 4 to 5 mile radius. Today, the radio station boasts a 60-mile radius, 10,000 watts, and 11 employees.

The largest African American owned and operated noncommercial educational radio station in my State of Iowa, KBBG Radio has provided almost \$1.8 million of public service announcements for nonprofit organizations in the last 8 years.

Mr. President, I proudly commend KBBG Radio, its owners and its employees for providing a valuable service to the Waterloo and Cedar Falls metro area and to northeast Iowa.

A model of self-development and community outreach, KBBG continues to build on its well-served motto, communicate to educate. Mr. President, I thank and congratulate KBBG for 18 years of service and extend my wishes for continued success in the future.

DR. BEATRICE BRAUDE AND JUSTICE DELAYED BUT NOT ULTIMATELY DENIED

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, this past Monday, the Washington Post reported that Justice Department attorneys have reached a settlement with lawyers representing the estate of Dr. Beatrice Braude concerning monetary damages equitably due for the wrongful dismissal of Dr. Braude from her Federal job in 1953 and subsequent blacklisting. The estate will receive \$200,000 in damages. Family members have announced that the funds—which Congress must now appropriate—will be donated to Hunter College, the institution from which Dr. Braude received her bachelor's degree.

This settlement stems from the enormously gratifying decision of U.S. Court of Federal Claims Judge Roger B. Andewelt on March 7, following a hearing last November, that the United States Information Agency (USIA) had wrongfully dismissed Dr. Braude and intentionally concealed the reason for her termination. He concluded that such actions constituted an equitable claim for which compensation is due.

Dr. Braude's suit was made possible through legislation then-Senator Javits and I originally introduced in 1979 and which Senator D'AMATO and I continued to press. When finally enacted, it lifted the statute of limitations, enabling the Court to hear Dr. Braude's case and hand down its decision. I know Senator D'AMATO shares my gratification with the settlement announcement.

With Judge Roger B. Andewelt's decision and this negotiated settlement, we have finally seen a measure of justice which brings back memories of an old and awful time. Dr. Braude, a linguist fluent in several languages, was dismissed from her position at the USIA in 1953 as a result of accusations of disloyalty to the United States. The accusations were old; 2 years earlier, the State Department's Loyalty Security Board had investigated and unanimously voted to dismiss them. The Board sent a letter to Dr. Braude stating "there is no reasonable doubt as to your loyalty to the United States Government or as to your security risk to the Department of State."

Dr. Braude was terminated 1 day after being praised for her work and informed that she probably would be promoted. USIA officials told that her that the termination was due to budgetary constraints. Congress had funded the USIA at a level 27 percent below the President's request. The Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954 (Public Law 83-207) authorized a reduction in force commensurate to the budget cut. Fair enough. As Dr. Braude remarked years later, "I never felt that I had a lien on a government job." But what Dr. Braude did not know is that she was selected for termination because of the old—and answered—charges against her. And because she did not know the real reason for her

dismissal, she was denied certain procedural rights (the right to request a hearing, for instance).

The true reason for her dismissal was kept hidden from her. When she was unable, over the next several years, to secure employment anywhere else within the Federal Government—even in a typing pool despite a perfect score on the typing test—she became convinced that she had been blacklisted. She spent the next 30 years fighting to regain employment and restore her reputation. Though she succeeded in 1982 (at the age of 69) in securing a position in the CIA as a language instructor, she still had not been able to clear her name by the time of her death in 1988. The irony of the charges against Dr. Braude is that she was an anti-communist, having witnessed firsthand communist-sponsored terrorism in Europe while she was an assistant cultural affairs officer in Paris and, for a brief period, an exchange officer in Bonn during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

Mr. President, I would like to review the charges against Dr. Braude because they are illustrative of that dark era and instructive to us even today. There were a total of four. First, she was briefly a member of the Washington Book Shop on Farragut Square that the Attorney General later labeled subversive. Second, she had been in contact with Mary Jane Keeney, a Communist Party activist employed at the United Nations. Third, she had been a member of the State Department unit of the Communist-dominated Federal Workers' Union. Fourth, she was an acquaintance of Judith Coplon.

With regard to the first charge, Dr. Braude had indeed joined the Book Shop shortly after her arrival in Washington in 1943. She was eager to meet congenial new people and a friend recommended the Book Shop, which hosted music recitals in the evenings. I must express some sensitivity here: my F.B.I. records report that I was observed several times at a "leftist musical review" in suburban Hampstead while I was attending the London School of Economics on a Fulbright Fellowship.

Dr. Braude was aware of the undercurrent of sympathy with the Russian cause at the Book Shop, but her membership paralleled a time of close U.S.-Soviet collaboration. She drifted away from the Book Shop in 1944 because of her distaste for the internal politics of other active members. Her membership at the Book Shop was only discovered when her name appeared on a list of delinquent dues. It appears that her most sinister crime while a member of the book shop was her failure to return a book on time.

Dr. Braude met Mary Jane Keeney on behalf of a third woman who actively aided Nazi victims after the war and was anxious to send clothing to another woman in occupied Germany. Dr. Braude knew nothing of Keeney's political orientation and characterized the meeting as a transitory experience.

With regard to the third charge, Dr. Braude, in response to an interrogatory from the State Department's Loyalty Security Board, argued that she belonged to an anti-Communist faction of the State Department unit of the Federal Workers' Union.

Remember that the Loyalty Security Board investigated these charges and exonerated her.

The fourth charge, which Dr. Braude certainly did not—or could not—deny, was her friendship with Judith Coplon. Braude met Coplon in the summer of 1945 when both women attended a class Herbert Marcuse taught at American University. They saw each other infrequently thereafter. In May 1948, Coplon wrote to Braude, then stationed in Paris and living in a hotel on the Left Bank, to announce that she would be visiting shortly and needed a place to stay. Dr. Braude arranged for Coplon to stay at the hotel. Coplon stayed for 6 weeks, during which time Dr. Braude found her behavior very trying. The two parted on unfriendly terms. The friendship they had prior to parting was purely social.

Mr. President, Judith Coplon was a spy. She worked in the Justice Department's Foreign Agents Registration Division, an office integral to the FBI's counterintelligence efforts. She was arrested early in 1949 while handing over notes on counterintelligence operations to Soviet citizen Valentine Gubitchev, a United Nations employee. Coplon was tried and convicted—there was no doubt of her guilt—but the conviction was overturned on a technicality. Gubitchev was also convicted but was allowed to return to the U.S.S.R. because of his quasi-diplomatic status.

I bring all this up because, as I mentioned earlier, it is instructive. The world is a dangerous place. On July 11, 1995—6 days before the 50th anniversary of the first successful detonation of an atomic bomb—the National Security Agency released 49 of some 2,200 coded messages sent by the KGB and decrypted between 1943 and 1980. The decoded messages have been kept classified until now. They are known as the VENONA intercepts.

The existence of a Soviet spy ring and the active involvement of American communists—fellow countrymen was the KGB code word for them—has long been established. Of late, details have been flooding in from Moscow. But this is the first American archive to be opened.

At the onset of the Cold War, in Edward Shils' memorable phrase, the American visage began to cloud over. Some saw conspiracy everywhere. Recall, that in 1951, Senator Joseph McCarthy published America's "Retreat from Victory: The Story of George Catlett Marshall." Some denied any such possibility and accused the accusers. Loyalty oaths and background checks proliferated, and all information became Top Secret. A culture of secrecy took hold within the American government, whilst a hugely

divisive debate raged in Congress and the press.

We got through it. But the world remains a dangerous place, and it is just possible that we might learn something from the VENONA files. Had they been published in 1950, we might have been spared the soft-on-communism charge that distorted our politics for four decades. We might have been spared the anti-anti-communist stance that was no less unhelpful.

The fact is, there were spies in this country and they did awful things—Coplon among them. But there were innocent people, too, like Dr. Braude, who were caught in a hall of mirrors.

My involvement in Dr. Braude's case dates back to early 1979, when Dr. Braude came to me and my colleague at the time, Senator Javits, and asked us to introduce private relief legislation on her behalf. In 1974, after filing a Freedom of Information Act request and finally learning the true reason for her dismissal, she filed suit in the Court of Claims to clear her name and seek reinstatement and monetary damages for the time she was prevented from working for the Federal Government. The Court, however, dismissed her case on the grounds that the statute of limitations had expired. On March 5, 1979, Senator Javits and I together introduced a bill, S. 546, to waive the statute of limitations on Dr. Braude's case against the U.S. Government and to allow the Court of Claims to render judgment on her claim. The bill passed the Senate on January 30, 1980. Unfortunately, the House failed to take action on the bill before the 96th Congress adjourned.

In 1988, and again in 1990, 1991, and 1993, Senator D'AMATO and I re-introduced similar legislation on Dr. Braude's behalf. Our attempts met with repeated failure. Until at last, on September 21, 1993, we secured passage of Senate Resolution 102, which referred S. 840, the bill we introduced for the relief of the estate of Dr. Braude, to the Court of Claims for consideration as a congressional reference action. The measure compelled the Court to determine the facts underlying Dr. Braude's claim and to report back to Congress on its findings.

The Court held a hearing on the case last November and Judge Andewelt issued his verdict in March. Forty-three years after her dismissal from the USIA and 8 years after her death, the Court found in favor of the estate of Dr. Braude.

Senator D'AMATO and I wish to express our profound admiration for Judge Andewelt's decision in which he absolved Dr. Beatrice Braude of the surreptitious charges of disloyalty with which she was never actually confronted. The Court declared that Dr. Braude "cared about others deeply and was loyal to her friends, family and country."

We are equally grateful to Christopher N. Sipes and William Livingston, Jr. of Covington & Burling, two of

the many lawyers who have handled Dr. Braude's case on a pro bono basis over the years. Mr. Sipes quite properly remarked that the decision represents an important page in the annals of U.S. history: "The Court of the United States has said it recognizes that this conduct is out of bounds. It tells the government it must acknowledge its wrongs and pay for them."

Anthony Lewis wrote about Dr. Braude's case on March 15 in his regular New York Times column, *Abroad at Home*. He properly warns us that the cause of the injustice to Beatrice Braude and other loyalty victims—secret proceedings—is not ancient history. The anti-terrorism bill had a provision to allow for the deportation of aliens on secret evidence. It was stripped, fortunately, during floor consideration in the House. But the provision is likely to reappear in some fashion. We must remain vigilant.

Now that the parties to the Braude case have reached an agreement on the monetary damages equitably due to Dr. Braude's estate, Senator D'AMATO and I will be offering legislation soon to release the \$200,000 to her estate. When that time comes, I hope that we will have the unqualified and unanimous support of our colleagues.

Ann Kirchheimer, a friend—now 80—who carried on Dr. Braude's fight, recently commented that Dr. Braude's life following her dismissal from the USIA could have been taken from the opening lines of Franz Kafka's book, *The Trial*: "Someone must have traduced Joseph K., for without having done anything wrong, he was arrested one fine morning." Indeed.

What happened to Dr. Braude was a personal tragedy. But it was also part of a national tragedy, too. This nation lost, prematurely and unnecessarily, the exceptional services of a gifted and dedicated public servant. Stanley I. Kutler, a professor of constitutional history at the University of Wisconsin, estimates that Dr. Braude was one of about 1,500 Federal employees who were dismissed as security risks between 1953 and 1956. Another 6,000 resigned under the pressure of security and loyalty inquiries, according to Professor Kutler, who testified as an expert witness on Dr. Braude's behalf last November. It was, as I said earlier, an awful time. We had settled "as on a darkling plain, Swept with confused alarm of struggle and flight, Where ignorant armies clash by night." It mustn't happen again.

I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the June 17, 1996, issue of the Washington Post, "\$200,000 Repayment Agreement for Estate of McCarthy-Era Victim", Mr. Lewis's March 15, 1996 column, "Secrecy and Justice," from the New York Times, and a letter dated June 19, 1996 from Mr. Sipes to my legislative director, Gray Maxwell, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 17, 1996]
\$200,000 REPAYMENT AGREEMENT FOR ESTATE OF MCCARTHY-ERA VICTIM

The estate of Beatrice "Bibi" Braude, who was fired from the U.S. Information Agency and blacklisted 43 years ago during a spasm of anti-communist zealotry, should be paid \$200,000, according to an agreement between the U.S. government and attorneys for her estate.

Funding the settlement is up to Congress. Braude fought for decades to clear her name after her firing in 1953. By the time she was in her seventies, she seemingly had exhausted all court remedies. After her death nearly nine years ago, her friends and relatives took up her cause and persuaded Sens. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) and Alfonse M. D'Amato (R-N.Y.) to sponsor legislation that mandated review of the case by the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

Attorneys for the Justice Department argued earlier this year that there was insufficient proof that loyalty concerns prevented Braude from being rehired for decades. The reason might have been, they argued, because she was a woman and in her forties. Judge Roger B. Andewelt disagreed, saying Braude was a loyal American persecuted "during a dark era in American history."

He ordered the Justice Department to negotiate an amount to pay Braude's estate. Christopher Sipes, of the law firm of Covington & Burling, who handled the case without a fee, said lawyers considered what Braude would have earned during the period of her blacklisting. The case, Sipes said, represents a rare acknowledgment of the wrongs committed by the government during the era associated with Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy.

Braude's niece, Ericka, responding to the agreement, said she was nearly speechless. "It's unbelievable," she said, "and it's about time."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1996]
ABROAD AT HOME; SECRECY AND JUSTICE
(By Anthony Lewis)

The case before him, the judge said, "harks back to a dark era in American history when Senator Joseph R. McCarthy was a powerful political force in this nation, when promising careers in the public and private sectors were arbitrarily cut short based on innuendo, unsubstantiated allegations and irrational fears. . . ."

That was the opening sentence of a remarkable opinion by Judge Roger B. Andewelt of the United States Court of Federal Claims. It told a story of long ago, but one with a moral for today.

Beatrice Braude came to Washington to work for the Government during World War II. She had college and graduate degrees, and she won lots of praise at work. In 1951 she went to the new United States Information Agency. On Dec. 30, 1953, she was told she was going to get a pay raise. The next day she was fired.

Why? They told her that Congress had cut the U.S.I.A. budget. But when she applied for other government jobs over the next several years, she got nowhere. She was even turned down for a position as a typist, although she had a perfect score on the Civil Service typing exam.

Ms. Braude went on to other work. She got a Ph.D. and was a tenured teacher at the University of Massachusetts. But she never again felt the exhilaration she had in government service, and her exclusion from it was a troubling mystery.

Then, when the Privacy Act became law in 1974, she got her records from the Govern-

ment. They showed she had been fired as a security risk.

She had been investigated by the State Department Loyalty Board in 1951 because of casual past associations with two people considered suspect. The board cleared her, finding that there was "no reasonable doubt" as to her loyalty. But the U.S.I.A., on the same evidence, decided to fire her—and to conceal the reason.

Mr. Braude sued, but the courts held that she was too late. In 1982 she finally went back to work for the Government—as a language instructor at the C.I.A. She died in 1988.

But her family, still angry at what had happened, persuaded Senators Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Alfonse D'Amato to sponsor a bill to compensate her for any wrongdoing. It was referred to the Court of Claims for a finding on whether she had a claim in law or equity.

Judge Andewelt said there was no basis for saying that Ms. Braude "was a security risk or was sympathetic to any political philosophy not within the mainstream." Indeed, he said, the record showed her to be "a rather typical American. She cared about others deeply and was loyal to her friends, family and country."

The judge found that the U.S.I.A. had "intentionally concealed" the reason for her dismissal and had "blacklisted" her thereafter. That was wrongdoing, he said, and gave Ms. Braude's heirs an equitable claim. The lawyers will work out the amount due, and the court will send that to Congress for action.

So, 43 years she was fired, 8 years after she died, Beatrice Braude got a kind of justice. I asked her lawyer, Christopher N. Sipes of Washington, why the effort on her behalf had been so persistent.

"She was happy," he said, "she served her country—and in a flash it was gone. In time, bewilderment turned to anger and frustration. She had friends and family who cared so much that they had the same burning desire to see justice done."

It would be nice to think that the cause of the injustice to Beatrice Braude and other loyalty victims—secret proceedings—is ancient history. But it is not.

The Clinton Administration has pressed for a so-called antiterrorism bill allowing the deportation of aliens on secret evidence. An unusual combination of civil libertarians on the right and left has just deleted that and other dangerous sections from the legislation. But the same proposals will be back on the floor next week as part of an immigration bill.

The National Rifle Association, in its criticism of the antiterrorism bill, made the case as well as anyone. "The constitutional right to confront one's accusers is a necessary safeguard against government abuses," it said. "Our nation has survived for 200 years without resorting to the use of secret evidence in criminal trials or deportation proceedings. Congress must not set a dangerous precedent by abandoning the right to confront evidence against you."

Re Estate of Beatrice Braude v. United States; Congressional Reference No. 93-645x.

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Washington, DC, June 19, 1996.

GRAY MAXWELL,
Legislative Director,
Hon. Daniel P. Moynihan,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. MAXWELL: It was a pleasure speaking with you yesterday. As we discussed, I am writing now to update you on the status of Dr. Braude's case. As you may

recall, on March 7, 1996, Judge Andewelt of the Court of Federal Claims ruled that Dr. Braude had been blacklisted by the Federal Government during the 1950s and 1960s on the basis of spurious allegations of disloyalty and that her state therefore had an equitable claim for compensation from the United States for the wrongs she suffered.

In its opinion, the court left open the amount of compensation due. Following negotiations with the Justice Department, the parties stipulated to \$200,000 as the appropriate amount of compensation. On June 3, 1996, Judge Andewelt issued his final report, "recommend[ing] to Congress that plaintiff's equitably entitled to \$200,000 from the United States." For your convenience, I have attached copies of the March 7 and June 3 rulings.

The next, and final, step in the Congressional Reference regarding Dr. Braude's case is submission of the final report issued by Judge Andewelt to a review panel composed of three judges of the Court of Federal Claims. See 28 U.S.C. §2509(d). This review should complete the Congressional Reference and result in transmission of a final report on Dr. Braude's case back to the Senate. See 28 U.S.C. §2509(e).

It is unclear how long the review panel will take with Dr. Braude's case. However, both the Justice Department and plaintiff have submitted a notice of acceptance of the hearing officer's report, and therefore neither party is seeking review or otherwise raising any objections or issues for the review panel to address. It is our hope that, in the light of both parties' acceptance of Judge Andewelt's report, that report will be adopted by the review panel expeditiously and without modification. It is thus our hope that the Senate will shortly be receiving a final report on Dr. Braude's case indicating that she is equitably due \$200,000 as a result of her wrongful blacklisting from government employment.

It is our understanding that payment of Dr. Braude's claim requires an appropriation from Congress. (In the alternative, it may be possible, if funds are already available, for her claim to be paid pursuant to a directive of Congress). For this reason, we urge you to discuss her case, and Judge Andewelt's favorite report, with members of the Appropriations Committee, and, more specifically, with the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and State. We understand that the Subcommittee has not yet scheduled a mark-up of its FY 1997 Appropriations Bill. We would be happy to accompany you to any meeting with the Staff and urge you to request that the Subcommittee bill include funding for Dr. Braude's claim.

Thank you again for your interest and assistance in this matter. Please feel free to call me or Joan Kutcher if we can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTOPHER SIPES.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, June 18, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,118,200,749,524.53.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,306.24 as his or her share of that debt.

HONORING THE RAGSDALES FOR CELEBRATING THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families are the cornerstone of America.

The data is undeniable: individuals from strong families contribute to the society. In an era when nearly half of all couples married today will see their union dissolve into divorce, I believe it is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken the commitment of "till death us do part" seriously, demonstrating successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and fidelity. These characteristics make our country strong.

For these important reasons, I rise today to honor Mr. Gene and Mrs. Vieta Ragsdale of Marshfield, MO, who on July 13, 1996, will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. My wife, Janet, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate a similar milestone. Gene and Vieta's commitment to the principles and values of their marriage deserves to be saluted and recognized. I wish them and their family all the best as they celebrate this substantial marker on their journey together.

EARL VARNEY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a most wonderful man and a dear friend of mine, Earl Varney. Earl Varney, a World War I Army veteran, will be honored by the community of Worland, WY, on Military Day, June 29, 1996. Earl will have celebrated his 100th birthday by that day! He is the oldest living veteran of that conflict now residing in Washakie County and quite possibly in the State of Wyoming.

Earl is absolutely an extraordinarily dazzling man. He is Wyoming's answer to George Burns! He has all of the energy, graciousness, wit and good humor and civility of George BURNS himself—and especially the wit! His good humor reminds me of the old adage that my Mother, who Earl knew well, used to share with me—"Humor is the universal solvent against the abrasive elements of life."

My dear father, Milward Simpson, also loved Earl Varney. They used to have a helluva lot of fun together. They were contemporaries in every sense. They were veterans of World War I, great friends and business associates. They also worked together in the American Legion. They had a shared and splendid lifetime of friendship and memories and love and affection. When my Dad died at the age of 95, Earl was one of the first to respond to offer his condolences.

In addition to personally knowing my parents and grandparents, Earl knew the parents and grandparents of my dear wife, Ann. He was at her parents' wedding. He is such a thoughtful and kind man, too, as he always remembers others and the memorable dates and times in their lives.

Earl served this Nation proudly in the final months of World War I before the Armistice. His dates of service were September 18, 1918 to November 26, 1918. He achieved the rank of Corporal. Not only did Earl give to the Nation in

uniform, he has also been a great contributor to the good of the entire State of Wyoming. He was born in Ansley, Nebraska on June 14, 1896 but he went on to become a true Wyomingite. After release from the Army in 1918, Earl moved to Thermopolis, WY, and worked as a pharmacist in the local drug store where he first met my wife's father, Ivan Schroll. His other professions over the years included managing a finance and insurance office in Greybull, Wyoming, owning the Varney Motors Ford dealership in Worland, WY, and operating the Worland Oil Corporations-Mobil Bulkplant and Service Stations. He also worked in real estate. Earl didn't really embark on any kind of a retirement program until he reached his mid 80's!!

We are so very fortunate to have Earl living among us in Wyoming. Earl is one of those special people that make up the core and fiber of the State—one of nature's nobleman. I cherish the years I have been the beneficiary of his counsel and friendship. My life is richer because of him. Those of us who know him so well think of him always as a rock solid citizen and a man who is authentic, honest and sincere—a man whose word is his bond. I know the proud community of Worland, WY, will be making June 29 a very special day for this good and dear man—Earl Varney. He so richly deserves it. God bless him.

REPUBLICANS STAND FOR CHILDREN

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I would like to address a subject that has received much attention during the last several weeks—the future of our children.

As a father myself, I share the concerns of the many who recently marched on The Mall this month at the Stand for Children rally. Certainly, parents, families, teachers, and community leaders all agree that children should be protected and nurtured. This is a universal sentiment. We all stand for children. Every child deserves a safe and loving environment, adequate nutrition and a full education.

Child poverty and its related problems, such as hunger, certainly deserve our attention. Child poverty is an especially pressing problem in South Dakota, where unemployment in some areas reaches as high as 85 percent. According to the Annie E. Casey Foundation, 17 percent of all South Dakota children live in poverty, compared to 21 percent nationwide. Federal programs are designed to address these issues and many states like South Dakota are doing an admirable job. Child poverty has dropped 3 percent in my State since 1985.

Looking out for the best interests of children is not a partisan issue. The budgets passed in Congress demonstrate that we are protecting children. Child nutrition programs received an increase in this fiscal year—